KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) 1 United States Attorney 2 EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 0722) Chief, Criminal Division 3 TRACIE L. BROWN (CSBN 184339) 4 Assistant United States Attorney 5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, CA 94102 6 Telephone: (415) 436-6917 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 11 12 No. 3-05-70302 EDL UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 13 PROPOSED ORDER AND STIPULATION Plaintiff, 14 WAIVING TIME UNDER RULE 5.1 AND EXCLUDING TIME FROM JULY 15, 2005 15 v. TO JULY 29, 2005 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION TARCILO CALDERA, 16 (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)) 17 Defendant. 18 The parties appeared before the Court on July 15, 2005. With the agreement of the parties, 19 and with the consent of the defendant, the Court enters this order (1) scheduling a new 20 preliminary hearing/arraignment date of July 29, 2005 at 9:30 a.m., before the Honorable Edward 21 M.Chen; (2) documenting the defendant's waiver of time limits under Federal Rule of Criminal 22 Procedure 5.1; and (3) documenting the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. 23 § 3161(h)(8)(A), from July 15, 2005 to July 29, 2005. The parties agreed, and the Court found 24 and held, as follows: 25 1. The defendant waived the time limits for a preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of 26 Criminal Procedure 5.1. Failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny 27 both defense and government counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking 28

STIPULATION AND ORDER

3-05-70302 EDL

1 2

3 4

5 6

> 7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

> STIPULATION AND ORDER 3-05-70302 EDL

into account the exercise of due diligence, and would deny the defendant continuity of counsel.

- 2. Counsel for the defense believes that postponing the preliminary hearing is in his client's best interest, and that it is not in his client's interest for the United States to indict the case before the July 29, 2005 preliminary hearing date. The parties are investigating a preindictment disposition of the case.
- 3. The defendant agreed to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. Failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny both government and defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would deny the defendant and the government continuity of counsel.
- 4. Given these circumstances, the Court found that the ends of justice served by excluding the period from July 15, 2005 to July 29, 2005, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Id. § 3161(h)(8)(A).
- 5. Accordingly, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court ordered that the period from July 15, 2005 to July 29, 2005, be excluded from Speedy Trial Act calculations under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B)(iv).
- 4. The Court scheduled a new preliminary hearing/arraignment date of July 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., before the Honorable Edward M. Chen.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: 7/15/05

DATED:

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 7/15/05

Assistant United States Attorney

VID FERMINO (MOISE BLANK)

Attorney for TARCILO CALDERA

HON. EDWARD M. CHEN

United States Magistrate Judge